



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/506,767	02/18/2000	Craig A. Link	MFCEP.68211	8104
45809 7590 12/13/2007 SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P. (c/o MICROSOFT CORPORATION) INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 2555 GRAND BOULEVARD KANSAS CITY, MO 64108-2613			EXAMINER AKINTOLA, OLABODE	
			ART UNIT 3691	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 12/13/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/506,767

Applicant(s)

LINK ET AL.

Examiner

Olabode Akintola

Art Unit

3691

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 September 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 30 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 and 31-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

The Declaration filed on 9/28/2007 under 37 CFR 1.131 is sufficient to overcome the Mann and Nesbitt references.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-6, 8, 11, 15-16, 24-28, 31-32, 34, 38 and 40-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lichty et al (America on line Tour Guide, 4th edition, 1998) ("Lichty").

Art Unit: 3691

Re claims 1, 16, 24-27, 31-32, 34, 38 and 40: Lichty teaches a method of producing a unique modified account name based on a requested account name that has been determined to already exist, the method comprising: receiving a requested account name from a user (Pages 428-429, 442-443); selecting a preexisting element from at least one preexisting list of elements (Pages 428-429, 442-443); combining the preexisting element and at least a stem of the requested account name to produce a modified account name (Pages 428-429, 442-443); comparing the modified account name with a list of existing account names to determine whether the modified account name is unique (Pages 428-429, 442-443); and, if the modified account name is unique, providing the modified account name to the user for acceptance (Pages 428-429, 442-443).

Lichty does not explicitly teach that the preexisting element is a word element. However, Lichty teaches alphanumeric element (Li5437; Pages 428-429, 442-443). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Lichty to include word elements including adjectives and other permitted strings and character, as a matter of design choice. One would have been motivated to do so in order to provide structured alternative screen names for a wider range of selectable choices to the requestor.

Re claims 2-5, 11 and 41-44: Lichty teaches wherein the preexisting word element is randomly selected from the at least one preexisting list of word elements (Pages 428-429, 442-443).

Re claims 6, 8, 15, and 28: Lichty teaches the limitations of claim 6, except for using numerical seed. However, Lichty teaches using alphanumeric element (Li5437; Pages 428-429, 442-443).

Art Unit: 3691

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Lichty to include numerical seeds, as a matter of design choice. One would have been motivated to do so in order to provide structured alternative screen names for a wider range of selectable choices to the requestor.

Claims 7, 9-10, 12-14, 17-23, 29-30, 33 and 45-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lichty in view of Blinne (USPN 5995730) ("Blinne").

Re claim 7 and 9-10: Lichty does not explicitly teach incrementing a numerical seed by one if the account name is not unique. Blinne teaches this limitation (abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Lichty to include this feature as taught by Blinne. One would have been motivated to do so in order to modify the account name to satisfy a set of rules until uniqueness is achieved.

Re claims 12-14 and 45-46: Blinne further teaches if the modified account name is not unique, the operations producing the unique modified account name are repeated on an iterative basis until a unique modified account name is produced (abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Lichty to include this feature as taught by Blinne. One would have been motivated to do so in order to modify the account name to satisfy a set of rules until uniqueness is achieved.

Art Unit: 3691

Blinne does not explicitly teach predetermined number of iterations. Official notice is hereby taken that this feature is old and well known. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Lichty to include this feature. One would have been motivated to do so in order to avoiding endless cycle of iteration, thereby saving time.

Re claim 17-23, 29-30, and 33: See claim 1 analysis above. Lichty teaches the limitations of claims 17-20 except combining a first (adjective) and second (noun) word elements to produce a random account. However, Lichty teaches alphanumeric element (Li5437; Pages 428-429, 442-443). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Lichty to include noun phrase to the invention as a matter of design choice. One would have been motivated to do so in order to provide structured alternative screen names for a wider range of selectable choices to the requestor.

Re claims 35-37 and 39: Lichty teaches receiving an alternate requested account name from the user (Pages 428-429, 442-443).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 30 is allowed.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.


Heidorn et al (USPN 5966686) combining an adjective and a noun to construct a noun phrase (col. 4, lines 1-7).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Olabode Akintola whose telephone number is 571-272-3629. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30AM -5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on 571-272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

OA



FAROOQ M. KAZIMI
PATENT EXAMINER